



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/788,540	02/21/2001	Shigeru Fujita	1484.1004	5606

21171 7590 11/02/2005

STAAS & HALSEY LLP  
SUITE 700  
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

EL HADY, NABIL M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2152

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/788,540	<b>Applicant(s)</b> FUJITA, SHIGERU	
	<b>Examiner</b> Nabil M. El-Hady	<b>Art Unit</b> 2152	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 August 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 August 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

1. Claims 1-9 are pending in this application.

2. Examiner acknowledge receipt and acceptance of "Replacement Sheet" for Fig. 9. Examiner also accepts applicant's arguments regarding Figures 7 and 8, and withdraw the objection of Figs 7 and 8.

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

4. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The following phrases are not clearly understood, and rendering the corresponding claims vague or indefinite:

a) "a virtual I/O port to directly transmit the control signal for the client-side I/O", claim 1, line 6, the insertion of directly here is not clearly understood, specially when the transmission is for ... not to....;

b) a virtual I/O port to "directly receive an I/O event from the client-side I/O device", claim 1, line 7, it is not clearly understood what the insertion of "directly" here means, specially when line 12-13 in the same claim cites a device handler to "directly transmit the I/O event received from the client-side device to the virtual I/O port". This clearly shows that the insertion of "directly" is making the claim vague.

c) “a device handler to directly receive from the server ... from the virtual I/O port in the server”, claim 1, lines 10-11, again the insertion of “directly” here does not distinctly define any specific relation when using “from” and “from”;

d) similar incidents for using “directly” in a way that is not clearly understood and rendering the claims vague and indefinite can be shown in claims 3, 4, and 9.

5. Claims 1-5, 7, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Walker et al. (US 6,390,917), hereinafter “Walker”.

6. As to claim 9, Walker discloses the invention substantially as claimed including a client/server system (Fig. 1) comprising: a client (SLOT MACHINE 14, 16, or 18, Fig. 1) comprising at least one I/O device (coin acceptor, col. 2, lines 1-2; or INTERACTIVE DISPLAY DEVICE 22, Fig. 1 and Fig. 6), and a programmed computer processor handling data communication (CPU, Fig. 6), including an I/O event from the at least one I/O device (receiving payment, col. 2, lines 1-3; or receiving player responses, col. 2, lines 27-30), via an I/O port connected to the at least one I/O device (inherent in the connection between 22 and CPU in Fig. 6); and a server communicably connectable with the client (12, Fig. 1) and comprising a programmed computer processor handling data communication (CPU 30, Fig. 2), including directly controlling the at least one I/O device of the client (col. 2, lines 32-36; and col. 4, lines 36-51) and handling the I/O event from the at least one I/O device of the client (col. 2, lines 36-38), via a virtual I/O port in the server (36, Fig. 2) to the at least one I/O device of the client.

7. Walker’s server controls what is displayed on the interactive display device as clearly disclosed (col. 2, lines 32-36; and col. 4, lines 36-51), however a display control subroutine 50

Art Unit: 2152

which resides in the client (50, Fig. 6) is responsible for enabling of the display of any a controlled message from the server, it is considered a device handler.

1. As to claim 1, the claim is rejected for similar reasons as claim 9 above. In addition, Walker discloses a client/server system comprising: a server (12, Fig. 1), comprising: software to generate operating instructions for an I/O device (col. 5, lines 15-17); a device driver to generate a control signal for the I/O device based on the operating instructions (col. 2, lines 32-36; col. 4, lines 36-51; and col. 5, lines 15-17); and a virtual I/O port (36, Fig. 2) to transmit the control signal and to receive an I/O event (coin acceptor, col. 2, lines 1-2; or INTERACTIVE DISPLAY DEVICE 22, Fig. 1 and Fig. 6); and a client (14, 16, 18, Fig. 1), comprising: a device handler (50, Fig. 6) to receive the control signal from the virtual I/O port, to control the I/O device that is coupled with the client based on the control signal (col. 5, lines 1-4), and to transmit the I/O event received from the I/O device to the virtual I/O port ( col. 5, lines 4-11).

2. As to claims 2-5, the claims are rejected for similar reasons as claims 1 and 9 above.

3. As to claim 7, Walker discloses the client/server system, wherein the client and server communicate via a LAN (col. 1, lines 62-65).

8. Claims 6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker .

4. As to claim 6, Walker does not specifically disclose a bar code reader as the I/O device. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that an I/O device may be any type of device that facilitates input from the user and

Art Unit: 2152

output to the user. The concept of controlling such device from a server as disclosed by Walker is not limited to a display device and may be applied to any other I/O device. Moreover, both the concept and the advantages of utilizing a bar code reader as an I/O device is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Walker to include a bar code reader in order to enhance and make it easier for slot machine users to input/ output certain types of products to the system.

5. As to claim 8, Walker does not disclose the client and server communicate via the WWW. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that nothing in the design of Walker's system prevent that server 12 may be connected to the slot machines 14, 16, and 18 via WWW according to what is known in the art at the time of the invention.

9. Applicant's arguments filed 8/15/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Therefore, rejection to claims 1-9 is maintained

10. In the remarks, applicants argued in substance that Walker fails to teach or suggest the claimed present invention, specifically "a device handler to directly receive from the server the control signal from the virtual I/O port of the server" ... "based upon system resources in the server" and "directly transmit the I/O event received from the client-side I/O device to the virtual I/O port in the server".

11. Examiner respectfully traverses applicants' remarks.

Art Unit: 2152

12. Walker discloses in col. 3, lines 27-36 that server 12 includes transaction processor subroutine for providing services for connected slot machines and to processes input signals from the players at the respective slot machine, that is the control of the slot machines is based on the system resources in the server. It is clear from Fig. 2 also that the server includes all system resources needed to control the slot machines.

13. Walker also discloses in col. 5, lines 1-11 that a device handler (display control subroutine) is called into action when a control signal is received from the server (a product/product purchase advertising message is received from the server).

14. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nabil M. El-Hady whose telephone number is (571) 272-3963. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 - 4:00.

Art Unit: 2152

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

October 31, 2005

  
Nabil El-Hady, Ph.D, M.B.A.  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2152